| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/759,786 | 01/12/2001 | Ralf Hofmann | P-4596 | 2858 |

| 24209 | 7590 | 09/26/2006 |
|---|---|---|

GUNNISON MCKAY & HODGSON, LLP
1900 GARDEN ROAD
SUITE 220
MONTEREY, CA 93940

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| BATES, KEVIN T |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2155 | |

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 09/759,786 | HOFMANN ET AL. |
| ✓ Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kevin Bates | 2155 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 June 2006</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.     2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-23 and 28-34</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>24-27</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) <u>34</u> is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-23 and 28-32</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>33</u> is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some *    c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

### *Response to Amendment*

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on June 26, 2006.

Claims 9-23 have been cancelled.

Claims 24-27 have been withdrawn due to restriction.

Claims 1-8 and 28-29 have been amended.

Claims 30-34 are newly added.

Claims 1-8 and 28-34 are pending in this application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1-23 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being**

**anticipated by Muta (6286003).**

**Regarding claims 1 and 28,** Muta teaches a method for presenting a runtime

environment component service by a first computer system to a second computer

system over a communication network (Column 8, lines 36 – 41), said method being

performed by said first computer system and comprising:

generating a user interface infrastructure, on said first computer system, to

receive graphic user interface events from a lightweight component on from said second

computer system (Column 9, lines 40 – 48) and to send remote graphic user interface

commands to said lightweight component on said second computer system (Column 9,

lines 48 – 52); wherein said remote graphic user interface commands are used in

generating a user interface on said second computer system for a user of said runtime

environment component service on said first computer system (Column 9, lines 40 –

52);

wherein said generating comprises:

receiving a call to a create bean window method of a bean service object

executing on said first computer from a bean object of said lightweight component

executing on said second computer system; and

calling an initialize method by said bean service object to create a bean window

object on said first computer system (Column 8, lines 8 – 21); and

using said user interface infrastructure to initialize said runtime environment

component service on said first computer system (Column 9, lines 40 – 52) wherein

said using comprises:

calling by said bean service object, a create instance method in an application

programming interface of a client factory object of said lightweight component;

initializing a remote frame window object in said lightweight component by said

client factory object executing on said second computer system (Column 8, lines 18 –

21); and

further, wherein said runtime environment component service sends graphic user

interface commands to said user interface infrastructure on said first computer system

said second computer system comprises a client device  (Column 6, lines 61 – 66) and

said first computer system comprises a server device (Column 7, line 58 – Column 8,

line 6).

**Regarding claim 2**, Muta teaches receiving, by <u>said bean window object in</u> said

user interface infrastructure, a remote input action event via said communication

network, said remote input action event being generated in said second computer

system by said lightweight component corresponding to said runtime environment

component service on said first computer system (Column 9, lines 40 – 48).

**Regarding claim 3**, Muta teaches transmitting an input event <u>said bean window</u>

<u>object to an application in</u> said runtime environment component service by said user

interface infrastructure in response to said remote input action event (Column 9, lines

40 – 48).

**Regarding claim 4**, Muta teaches processing said input event by said

<u>application in said</u> runtime environment component service (Column 9, lines 40 – 48).

**Regarding claim 5**, Muta teaches generating a graphic user interface command

<u>to said bean window object</u> by <u>said application in</u> said runtime environment component

service (Column 9, lines 40 – 52).

**Regarding claim 6**, Muta teaches transmitting a remote graphic user interface

command <u>from said bean window object</u> to said <u>remote frame window in said</u>

lightweight component in response to said graphic user interface command (Column 11,

lines 1 – 21).

**Regarding claim 30**, Muta teaches calling an initialize method, by said bean

service object, to create a bean frame object on said first computer system

**Regarding claim 31**, Muta teaches receving, by said bean frame object, a load

document command from said bean object of said lightweight component (Column 9,

lines 10 – 16).

**Regarding claim 32**, Muta teaches calling, by said bean frame object in

response to said load document command, an initialize method to initialize a window for

an application in said runtime environment component (Column 9, lines 18 – 21).

**Regarding claims 7 and 29**, Muta teaches a method for presenting a runtime

environment component service by a first computer system to a second computer

system over a communication network (Column 8, lines 36 – 41), said method being

performed by said first computer system and comprising:

receiving a remote input action command, <u>by a bean window object in</u> a runtime

environment component service on said first computer system, via said communication

network, said remote input action command being generated in said second computer

system <u>by a remote frame window object in</u> a lightweight component corresponding to

said runtime environment component service on said first computer system (Column 9,

lines 40 – 48);

transmitting a local input action command from <u>said bean window object</u> to <u>an</u>

<u>application in</u> said runtime environment component service in response to said remote

input action command (Column 9, lines 40 – 48);

processing said local input action command by <u>said application in</u> said runtime

environment component service (Column 9, lines 48 – 52);

generating a local output command by said runtime environment component

service <u>to said bean window object</u> on said first computer system; and

transmitting a remote output command from <u>said bean window object</u> to said

<u>remote frame window in</u> said lightweight component in response to said local output

command (Column 9, lines 48 – 52) wherein said remote output command is used in

generating a user interface on said second computer system for a user of said runtime

environment component service on said first computer system comprises a client device

(Column 6, lines 61 – 66) and said first computer system comprises a server device

(Column 7, line 58 – Column 8, line 6).

**Regarding claim 8**, Muta teaches that said application in said runtime

environment component service is in an office application suite (Column 11, lines 1 –

21).

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

Claim 33 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 34 allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art of record does not teach or suggest neither singly nor in combination the features of a method of presenting a runtime environment on a first computer to operate a second computer over a network that includes initializing a lightweight bean service object on the first computer which receives remote graphic user interface commands, including remote input action events and load document commands using load URL methods.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that the in the reference, Muta, the slave daemon (the second computer) responds to connection requests, not calls from a bean object of the lightweight component as seen in the claims. The examiner disagrees, as seen in Column 8, lines 8 – 21, the slave daemon initiates the lightweight java object on the master computer in response to a connection requests, but once that object and connection is setup the java object handles all calls to the slave daemon (Column 9, lines 26 – 35).

Regarding claim 7, the applicant argues that the reference, Muta, does not

disclose a bean window object, a remote frame window, or an application and the

interactions. The examiner disagrees, as seen in Column 8, lines 13 – 21 and Column

9, lines 26 – 43, Muta's system operates through the use of a Java application sent from

the slave computer to the master computer, the Java programming language inherently

uses object oriented programming and so it uses objects in the application running both

on the master computer and slave computer, and as seen in the mapping these objects

fulfill the limitations of the claim.

### *Prior Art*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No. 6880126 issued to Bahrs, because it discloses a remote GUI

that accesses a target to retrieve documents.

U. S. Patent No. 7020882 issued to Lewallen, because it discloses a system

remote controlling a system through a GUI.

U. S. Patent No. 6717593 issued to Jennings, because it discloses a system for

allowing a client through an interface to retrieve documents.

U. S. Patent No. 6323881 issued to Broulik, because it teaches a GUI server that

allows HTML files to be requested.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KB

KB
September 15, 2006

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER